

Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of October 7, 2004, in which claims 1 - 6 and 9 were rejected over prior art, and claims 7 and 8 were objected to, but found to contain allowable matter.

The rejection of claims 1 - 3 was well taken, and the comments regarding claims 7 and 8 were appreciated; however, we believe that claims 4 - 6 are also patentable over the prior art, and ask the examiner to reconsider them in view of the following remarks.

The examiner's analysis of Landry with respect to claims 1 - 3 is correct. We have accordingly canceled those claims. However, Landry does not anticipate claim 4, which has been rewritten to include the limitations of canceled claims 1 and 3. We also added the phrase "with respect to the hammer" at line 12 of claim 4, which is supported by the application as filed at drawings 3 - 6 (note the variable angle α). It is the relative pivoting between the rocker and the hammer which causes the transfer bar to move in the channel.

In Landry, the hammer pivots on a pin 35 (which is stationary) and the trigger pivots on different pin 57. Landry's rocker 65 pivots on the same pin 57 that the *trigger* pivots on.

In the present invention, the rocker and the hammer pivot on the same pin, as recited in claim 4. The linkage recited in claim 5 causes the rocker to pivot backward, in a direction opposite (claim 6) to the pivot direction of the trigger, when the trigger is pulled. The rocker moves the transfer bar upward in its channel as the hammer falls forward only when the rocker is held in its backward position by the trigger.

Landry does not disclose the limitations of claims 4, 5 and 6 discussed in the previous paragraph.

We believe the Caldwell patent is less pertinent than Landry. The part 5,12 is a single piece which actually cannot pivot with respect to the hammer. Thus the present claim 4 distinguishes Caldwell. As Caldwell says at page 1, lines 69 - 73, "the hammer face is retained on the body by a bridge 6, whereby said movable face [5] is kept at all times firmly against the front of the hammer-body". [reference added]

We submit as well that the invention of claim 4 is not obvious from any combination of the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, we believe that claims 4 - 9 distinguish the invention from the prior art, and that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910

(301) 589-8900

March 1, 2005

I certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on March 1, 2005 by facsimile to 703.872.9306

